

7 October 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Morning Meeting Minutes of 7 October 1969

ADD/I briefed on the preliminary assessment of the last KH-4 mission

25X1

The Director and the ADD/I discussed the need for charts at tomorrow's NSC meeting. ADD/I promised two charts, one displaying collection programs that are pertinent to SALT and the other displaying new Soviet strategic weapons identified since the Director last briefed on this matter. ADD/I mentioned that these two charts will be available for the Director's review late this afternoon.

25X1

D/ONE reported that they have completed a Staff Memorandum on the political role of the military in Latin America. After some discussion of similar studies under way in response to the Director's request (see Morning Meeting Minutes of 29 September) and an NSSM, the Director concurred in D/ONE's giving the Memorandum limited outside distribution. D/ONE provided the Director with three copies for his possible personal distribution.

25X1

D/ONE noted that there will be no requirement for a USIB meeting this week. The Director concurred.

DD/S mentioned an earlier decision to invite various cafeteria caterers to survey our requirements. He briefed on the request of [ ] that such a survey be postponed until 15 November, since GSI is currently under audit. In response to the Director's question

TOP SECRET

DD/S noted that GSA has a list of seven or eight cafeteria caterers who might be invited to survey our problem.

Houston reported that he had dinner last night with the Committee of General Counsels of Private Industry. He commented that our relationships with this group are good and spoke of Marshall Green's good speech.

The Director called the DD/S&T's attention to the item in today's Washington Post naming Ruben F. Mettler, executive vice president of TRW, as Chairman of the President's Task Force on Science Policy.

DDCI noted that General Jack Davis, Assistant Director of the Weapons Evaluation and Control Bureau of ACDA, is being replaced by Vice Admiral Lee, who had asked him for a briefing on SALT. The Director concurred in undertaking this briefing but expressed his desire that the Admiral receive a full briefing from ACDA before any visit here.

DDCI noted receipt of an invitation to the Director to participate in a joint war game. [REDACTED] The Director asked the DDCI to take on this task.

DD/P noted that Senators Fulbright and Cook will be traveling to Port of Spain, Trinidad.

DD/P mentioned receipt of a good intelligence report describing Soviet interests in Beirut.

DD/P noted [REDACTED] nervousness over Senator Symington's projected hard look at Laos. The Director expressed no particular worry over this matter.

[REDACTED]

25X

The Director noted David Broder's piece in today's Washington Post, "A Risky New American Sport: 'The Breaking of the President.'"

The Director asked the DD/P to get in touch with the Acting Director of Training to determine the identity of the Senior Seminar participant and where he has served which might have caused him to make the remark that our program and people leave something to be desired.

[REDACTED]

L. K. White

25X

TOP SECRET

25X

7 OCT 1969

Joyce



David S. Broder

## A Risky New American Sport: 'The Breaking of the President'

CAMBRIDGE, Mass. — If there are any smart literary agents around these days, one of them will copyright the title "The Breaking of the President" for the next big series of nonfiction best-sellers. It is becoming more obvious with every passing day that the men and the movement that broke Lyndon B. Johnson's authority in 1968 are out to break Richard M. Nixon in 1969.

The likelihood is great that they will succeed again, for breaking a President is, like most feats, easier to accomplish the second time around. Once learned, the techniques can readily be applied as often as desired — even when the circumstances seem less than propitious. No matter that this President is pulling troops out of Vietnam, while the last one was sending them in; no matter that in 1969 the casualties and violence are declining, while in 1968 they were on the rise. Men have learned to break a President, and, like any discovery that imparts power to its possessors, the mere availability of this knowledge guarantees that it will be used.

The essentials of the technique are now so well understood that they can be applied with little waste motion.

First, the breakers arrogate to themselves a position of moral superiority. For that reason, a war that is unpopular, expensive and very probably unwise is labeled as immoral, indecent and intolerable. Critics of the President who are indelicate enough to betray partisan motives are denounced. (That for you, Fred Harris.) Members of the President's own party who, for reasons perhaps unrelated to their own flagging political careers, catapult themselves into the front ranks of the opposition are greeted as heroes. (Hooray for Charley Goodell.)

THE STUDENTS who would fight in the war are readily mobilized against it. Their teachers, as is their custom, hasten to adopt the students' views. (News item: The Harvard department of biochemistry and molecular biology last week called for immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.)

Next, a New England election (the New Hampshire primary is best but the Massachusetts Sixth Congressional District election will do as well) surprisingly shows that peace is popular at the polls. The President's party sees defeat staring it in the face unless it repudiates him, and the Harris poll promptly comes along to confirm his waning grip on public trust. The Chief Executive, clearly panicky, resorts to false bravado and says he will never be moved by these protests and demonstrations, thus confirming the belief that he is too stubborn to repent and must be broken.

And then, dear friends, Sen. Fulbright and the Foreign Relations Committee move in to finish off the job.

All this is no fiction; it worked before and it is working again. Vietnam is proving to be what Henry Kissinger once said he suspected it might be — one of those tragic, cursed messes that destroys any President who touches it.

That being the case, any President interested in saving his own skin would be well-advised to resign his responsibility for Vietnam and publicly transfer the assignment of ending the war to Congress or the Vietnam Moratorium Committee or anyone else who would like to volunteer for the job.

But he cannot. And that is the point the protesters seem to overlook. Assume that they and the President are both right when they assert the time has come to end this war. Assume that the protesters know better than the President how to

do so — despite the conspicuous absence of specific alternatives to the President's policies in their current manifestos.

THERE IS STILL a vital distinction, granting all this, to be made between the constitutionally protected expression of dissent, aimed at changing national policy, and mass movements aimed at breaking the President by destroying his capacity to lead the nation or to represent it at the bargaining table.

The point is quite simple. Given the impatience in this country to be out of that miserable war, there is no great trick in using the Vietnam issue to break another President. But when you have broken the President, you have broken the one man who can negotiate the peace.

Hanoi will not sit down for secret talks with the Foreign Relations Committee. Nor can the Vietnam Moratorium's sponsors order home a single GI or talk turkey to Gen. Thieu about reshaping his government. Only the President can do that.

There is also the matter of time. It is one thing to break a President at the end of his term, as was done last year. It is quite another thing to break him at the beginning, as is being attempted now.

The orators who remind us that Mr. Nixon has been in office for nine months, should remind themselves that he will remain there for 39 more months — unless, of course, they are willing to put their convictions to the test by moving to impeach him.

Is that not, really, the proper course? Rather than destroying his capacity to lead while leaving him in office, rather than leaving the nation with a broken President at its head for three years, would not their cause and the country be better served

by resort to the constitutional method for removing a President?

And what a wonderful chapter it would make for Volume 2 of "The Breaking of the President" series.

7 OCT 1969

Joyce

# Report on Gromyko Sessions

## Nixon Sees Rogers On Talks at U.N.

By Carroll Kilpatrick  
Washington Post Staff Writer

President Nixon conferred for an hour and 20 minutes yesterday with Secretary of State William P. Rogers on the latter's meetings over the last two weeks with world leaders at the United Nations.

Rogers met with a variety of officials but public attention was concentrated on his three meetings with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko. Many observers had expected Gromyko to give Rogers a date and site for arms limitation talks, but he did not.

When Gromyko is in the United States he often calls on the President at the White House, but Press Secretary Ronald L. Ziegler said there are no plans for such a meeting now.

Rogers plans to return to New York Wednesday night for two more days of meetings at the U.N.

On Sunday, Rogers will make his first appearance as Secretary of State on NBC's "Meet the Press" interview program, the State Department confirmed.

On a domestic issue, the President announced that there would be a White House Conference on Aging in November 1971.

He said that "much of the progress" on action to help older people "can be traced back to the last White House Conference on Aging which was called by President Eisenhower and held nearly a decade ago."

With careful planning and broad representation, the new conference "can help develop a more adequate national pol-

icy for older Americans," the President said.

John B. Martin, commissioner on aging in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and special assistant to the President on aging, will direct the conference.

The President also named two more task forces to advise him on problems of the 1970s. One is a task force on priorities in higher education and the other a task force on science policy.

Members of the education task force are:

Chairman, James M. Hester, president, New York University; George F. Budd, president, Kansas State College; James C. Fletcher, president, University of Utah; Luther H. Foster, president, Tuskegee Institute; Alexander Heard, chancellor, Vanderbilt University; John A. Howard, president, Rockford College; Howard W. Johnson, president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Edward H. Levi, president, University of Chicago; Sebastian Martorena, vice chancellor for Two-Year Colleges, State University of New York; Neil H. McElroy, chairman of the board, The Procter & Gamble Company; Malcolm C. Moos, president, University of Minnesota; Albert L. Nickerson, director, Mobil Oil Corp.; Rosemary Park, vice chancellor, University of California at Los Angeles; John E. Sawyer, president, Williams College; Paul E. Waldschmidt, president, University of Portland; John C. Weaver, president, University of Missouri.

Members of the Task Force on Science Policy are:

Chairman, Ruben F. Mettler, executive vice president, TRW, Inc.; Warren G. Bennis, vice president for Academic Development, State University of New York at Buffalo; Elmer W. Engstrom, chairman of the executive committee, RCA Corporation; Solomon Fabricant, professor of economics, New York University; Robert J. Glaser, dean, Stanford University School of Medicine; Philip Handler, president, National Academy of Sciences; Oscar Ruebhausen, Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons & Gates, New York; Gen. Bernard Schriever, USAF (Ret.), Schriever & McKee Associates, Inc., Arlington, Va.; Chauncey Starr, dean, School of Engineering and Applied Science, University of California; H. Guyford Stever, president, Carnegie-Mellon University; Charles H. Townes, professor-at-large, Department of Physics, University of California; Alvin M. Weinberg, director, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.